

## CONCESSION POLICY FOR TOWN LAKE PARK

Final Draft 7-17-90

### SUMMARY

In June 1988, City Council directed the Parks and Recreation Department to develop a concession policy for Town Lake Park. A major part of that policy was adopted by Council as part of the Town Lake Park Ordinance, in January 1989. Most of the remaining recommendations in this report were developed by the Committee that considered Town Lake Park concessions in 1988. That Committee was composed of representatives of the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board, the Parks and Recreation Board, and the Design Commission. The rest of the recommendations originated with Parks and Recreation Department staff.

The report is divided into six categories:

1. Rationale, which describes the principles upon which this report is based.
2. Permitting, which describes the procedures that are already in place for considering new concessions in the Park and adds a provision for public notification and hearing for any proposed permanent concessions.
3. Terms, which recommends standard contract terms for concessions in the Park.
4. Contract Provisions, which includes additional standard contract provisions.
5. Design Standards, which recommends design guidelines to govern concession facilities in the Park.
6. Items for Council Action

### RATIONALE

This report is based on the following considerations:

- \* Park concessions, appropriately developed, are beneficial to park users and to the City.

Existing park concessions provide a variety of activities that have become traditional in Town Lake Park; among them, canoe rentals on Barton Creek, paddleboat rides on Town Lake, and snacks at Barton Springs Pool. The City benefits not only from the services provided to park users, but also from the fact that private businesses are assuming the risks of providing those services.

\* The development of additional park concessions is a good way to increase the variety of activities available to park users.

The Town Lake Comprehensive Plan envisions a park in which a wider variety of activities are available throughout the park. Currently, all but one of our existing concessions is located west of I-35, and few activities other than boating are provided.

\* It is essential that park concessions not degrade the environmental quality of the park, and not detract from the park users' experience of the park.

The idea of concessions is to provide park users with more ways to enjoy their parks. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that park concessions not damage the park environment, or detract from the very qualities that brings people to the park in the first place. This principle is true both in the development of individual concessions, and also in the aggregate development of concessions in the Park, to eliminate the danger of incremental overuse of the Park.

\* All concessions should be compatible with the Town Lake Comprehensive Plan.

The Town Lake Comprehensive Plan has been adopted by ordinance of City Council, and incorporated into the City Code. The development of new concessions should be consistent with the Plan.

\* The City should encourage the development of appropriate permanent facilities.

Most permanent concessions, for example boat rentals, are more appropriately located in permanent buildings. Most existing permanent concession facilities are haphazard structures that do not contribute to the overall ambiance of the park. The City should encourage and facilitate the development of more appropriate concession facilities.

\* Service concessions are required to have a recreational programming component.

Concessions which provide recreational activities, as opposed to those which simply sell food and beverages, should include program elements such as lessons, safety instruction, utilization by non-profit/charitable groups, etc., which promote and educate the public about the benefits of the leisure services they supply.

#### PERMITTING

The Town Lake Park Ordinance established a procedure under which new permanent concessions may be permitted in Town Lake Park. Section 10-4-53 of the City Code reads in part:

(a) The Parks and Recreation Department shall present an annual report, in October, to a joint meeting of the Waterfront Planning



Advisory Board and the Parks and Recreation Board. This report shall also be provided to the Environmental Board. The Waterfront Planning Advisory Board, Parks and Recreation Board, and Environmental Board shall, within 30 days of the receipt of the report, make recommendations to City Council regarding appropriate concessions in Town Lake Park, the status of existing concessions, and the advisability of issuing a request for proposals (RFPs) for concessions in Town Lake Park.

The intent of this section is to provide for annual monitoring of the carrying capacity of Town Lake Park for concessions, by the Boards charged with responsibility for the Park. Such an annual monitoring is necessary to establish a carrying capacity for the Lake. The first annual report was presented to the Boards in September 1989.

Prior to the issuance of any RFP for permanent concessions, neighborhood and environmental organizations, along with other interested citizen groups, should be notified and allowed a sixty (60) day period to comment on the proposed recommendations.

Temporary concessions are defined as those requiring no permanent structures or other improvements to park land, having a contract of one year or less in length, and resulting in less than \$5000/year in revenue to the City. They are now permitted at the discretion of the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department. Facilities and locations should be approved by the Town Lake Park Coordinator. It is recommended that this process continue.

#### CONTRACT PROVISIONS - NON-NEGOTIABLE

Current concession contracts contain a variety of provisions. For new concessions, and for renegotiated contracts as the current concession contracts expire, more standard contract provisions would ensure more consistent operation of Town Lake Park concessions in the City's interest.

The following standard provisions are recommended for all permanent concession contracts:

1. **Non-performance penalties.** Currently the City has no enforcement provisions for contract performance, short of termination. It is recommended that a schedule of non-performance penalties with the possibility of termination be developed, to ensure contract performance more easily.
2. **Monthly payments.** Some existing contracts are set up on a quarterly, rather than monthly, payment schedule. For ease of recordkeeping, all future contracts should be on a monthly payment schedule.
3. **Reporting.** Included with their monthly payment, each concession shall provide information about that month's concession operations as specified on a reporting form to be supplied by PARD. The income tax

reports for each concession should be provided to PARD automatically each year.

4. Hours. Minimum hours during which the concession will be operated should be specified in the contract.

5. Signage. Signage should be provided by the concessionaire, listing hours of operation and prices and a Parks and Recreation Department phone number for information.

6. Water Safety. All water activities should cease during high water, emergency water releases, and violent weather.

7. Compensation for loss of business. No compensation should be given to concessionaires for loss of business caused by acts of God, high water, low water, or special events permitted by PARD.

8. Packaging Requirements. All concessions selling packaged goods should be required to use biodegradable packaging material where available, to prohibit the use of styrofoam and glass containers, and to provide for the recycling of all recyclable materials.

9. Citizen Comments. Ample opportunity should be provided for citizen comments and suggestions. At a minimum, a locked suggestion box, built to PARD specifications, shall be installed at each concession to receive citizen's comments, on a standard form to be supplied by PARD.

10. Transfer of Ownership. Ownership of either permanent or temporary concessions may not be transferred or leased. *ensure quality*

11. Dismantling Bond. A sufficient bond shall be paid to cover the cost of dismantling the concession facilities, should the concession be abandoned.

12. Reversion. All permanent concession facilities revert to the ownership of the City of Austin at the end of the term of the concession contract.

#### CONTRACT PROVISIONS - NEGOTIABLE

Terms and lengths of permanent concession contracts in place in 1989 vary substantially, largely because the contracts were negotiated at different times. In order to insure equity for both the concessionaires and the City, standard contract terms and lengths need to be established, while still allowing the City flexibility to encourage high quality public improvements.

**Standard Length** It is recommended that the standard length of contracts shall be five years unless otherwise negotiated based on the permanent facilities proposed.

**Standard Terms** It is recommended that the standard percentage to be



paid by permanent concessionaires to the City shall be 10% minimum of gross sales less sales tax unless otherwise negotiated.

In order to encourage private investment in public facilities, it is recommended that the City have the flexibility to vary both the length and terms of the contracts, in cases where a substantial private investment in public concession facilities warrants it. This flexibility could also be used to promote concession development in less used parts of the Park and to gain additional revenues in very heavily used parts of the Park.

It is also recommended that there be the flexibility to award contracts longer than 5 years to concessionaires willing to make substantial investments in permanent facilities. This will enable those concessionaires willing to invest in public improvements to obtain the necessary financing. The maximum length of contract recommended is 5 years with three renewable five year options. All permanent concession facilities become the property of the City of Austin when the concession contract expires.

Exclusive rights to provision of a service or product on parkland is not implied or guaranteed in any concession contract. Limiting the types of adjacent concessions is considered a negotiable contract provision, to be based on the proposed amount of investment.

Temporary concessions are defined as those having contracts of less than one year in length. Temporary concessions are required to pay a minimum of 15% of their gross revenues to the City.

#### DESIGN STANDARDS

One of the objectives of the Town Lake Comprehensive Plan is greater consistency and higher quality in park buildings and furniture than now exists. The following recommendations are based on the Town Lake Comprehensive Plan Design Manual. All permanent structures built by concessionaires shall be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Board and the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board. The following design standards apply only to permanent concessions in Town Lake Park.

#### **Buildings**

1. All building designs shall be sealed by a registered Architect.
2. Use of native stone, especially limestone, as a building material is recommended.
3. Use of terre colored standing seam galvanized steel roofs is recommended.
4. Use of ornamental ironwork is recommended, and if used, should be painted to PARC specifications regarding application, paint type and color.

5. Use of wood in contact with the ground should be avoided.
6. Public restrooms are recommended in all permanent concessions.
7. Concession facilities should be handicapped accessible.

#### Sitework

1. All park furniture, including signage, benches, gates, trash containers and fences, should be to PARD design and specifications.
2. All plant materials should be drought tolerant, and irrigation shall be supplied to all planted areas.
3. Utilities, including public telephones, should be supplied to all permanent facilities that are not subject to flooding, and should be underground.
4. Projects involving substantial site development should be sealed by a registered landscape architect.

#### Boats

1. Excursion boats should have an approved location for service access, and approved waste disposal systems.
2. Shoreline erosion will be a major factor in permitting excursion boats.

#### Review Process

1. All designs should be developed in consultation with PARD Landscape Architect, and must be approved by PARD.
2. All structures are subject to design review by the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board and the Parks and Recreation Board.
3. All improvements, including planting and utilities, must be in place within one year from the date the contract is awarded. Exceptions will be granted only if unforeseeable delays arise in the City permitting process.
4. The concessionaire is responsible for securing all necessary permits and approvals.
5. All proposed park developments must comply with the requirements of Waterfront Overlay Zone, the Town Lake Park Ordinance, and Chapter 13-2 of the Austin City Code of 1981. Marinas and watercraft must comply with Chapter 4-3 of the Austin City Code. Prospective concessions involving watercraft should consult with the Park Police Lake Patrol (477-9762/477-6904) before submitting proposals, to ascertain the suitability of the proposed vessels and landings, and the conditions of



the Lake.

6. Concessions shall be permitted on Town Lake according to the following procedure:

a. Concession proposals and staff recommendations, concerning those proposals or other recommended concessions, shall be presented to an appropriate subcommittee of the Parks and Recreation Board.

b. That subcommittee shall make recommendations on the proposals to a joint meeting of the Parks and Recreation Board and the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board.

c. At the joint meeting it will be determined which of the presented proposals shall go forward to a public hearing.

d. A public hearing before a joint meeting of the Parks and Recreation Board and the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board will be scheduled 60 days hence, with appropriate public notice. Signs will be posted at the prospective locations of the proposed concessions, including among other information the date of the public hearing.

e. After the public hearing the two Boards will decide which (if any) of the concession proposals will be recommended to City Council for inclusion in a Request for Proposals for concessions in Town Lake Park.

f. The appropriate subcommittee shall review and approve the proposed RFPs before they are submitted to City Council.

#### ITEMS FOR COUNCIL ACTION

1. A Town Lake Trust Fund should be established to accept all revenues from concessions, as well as other funds generated by Town Lake Park activities, such as special events. The monies from the trust fund should be used for development in Town Lake Park, and acquisition of additional parkland in the Town Lake Corridor. Any concession revenue received prior to the establishment of this trust fund shall be kept in an escrow account and deposited to the trust fund when it is established.

2. The policy of requiring all concession contracts to go through the Purchasing Department and comply with purchasing requirements should be reconsidered. Under the current procedures, concession contracts are treated as purchases, and subject to all the purchasing controls that are routinely applied to City purchases. This is the case even though concession contracts involve revenue to the City, rather than expenditures by the City. The resulting process is slow, cumbersome, and frequently, slightly absurd.

3. Park Police should be equipped to patrol Town Lake by boat, especially during peak use. In addition, Park Police patrols should be

expanded to allow them to help concessionaires provide security for and guard against vandalism to their facilities, particularly during the night and other low use periods.

#### CONCLUSION

The Town Lake Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted by ordinance on January 26, 1989, describes the City of Austin policy on the future development of Town Lake Park. Concessions are certainly a component of that recommended development. It is important that concessions in Town Lake Park be located and developed in a way compatible with the Town Lake Comprehensive Plan. The preceding policy is intended to provide a clear direction to existing and future concessionaires in Town Lake Park, as well as to the citizens of Austin.





# MEMORANDUM

TO: Parks and Recreation Board Members

FROM: Manuel A. Mollinedo, Director  
Parks and Recreation Department

DATE: August 22, 1990

SUBJECT: Waivers for Alcoholic Beverages

Many of you are aware that the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is authorized by ordinance to waive the prohibition of alcoholic beverages in PARD facilities. Most of the requests are for weddings to be held in recreation centers, but some are for events in facilities where I feel alcoholic beverages may not be appropriate. At present, should a request for waiver be denied, we do not have an appeal process.

I would like to have the Parks and Recreation Board serve as the appeal board should citizens wish to appeal my decision. If you feel this is something the Board would be willing to do, I suggest that a committee be established to develop an appeal process which defines the Board's role.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Manuel A. Mollinedo, Director  
Parks and Recreation Department

MAM:jh



# County of TRAVIS

STATE OF TEXAS

SUSAN A. SPATARO, CPA, CMA  
COUNTY AUDITOR

TRAVIS COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
P.O. BOX 1748  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78767  
(512) 473-9125

To: Editorial Board, Austin American Statesman  
From: Susan Spataro, Travis County Auditor  
RE: Consolidation

My office was requested by a member of the Commissioners' Court to analyze the numbers presented by the AMEGO Committee and specifically the consultant's report prepared by Katherine and Jim Ray (for which the City of Austin and Travis County contracted to pay \$100,000) regarding consolidation of the county and city parks. Specific issues that we were asked to address were would the proposed consolidation actually generate tax savings to Travis County taxpayers and were the savings suggested by AMEGO a result of economies of scale or reductions in the levels of service.

Within the time constraints that we were afforded and based on the documentation provided by Ray and Associates and the AMEGO committee, our analysis concluded that economies of scale and the resulting cost savings to Travis County taxpayers were not only undocumented, but that based on the data available at that time from Ms. Beverly Griffiths, the costs of maintaining the Travis County and LCRA parks at the current level of service would actual INCREASE the costs to Travis County taxpayers. It was our further conclusion that cost savings alleged by the AMEGO committee and Ray and Associates were the result of reductions in the level of parks maintenance in Travis County and LCRA parks and that due to insufficient research and documentation of the full cost impact of such a consolidation even those alleged savings were probably overstated. After hearing the testimony of Terrell Blodgett of the LBJ School of Public Affairs, Waggoner Carr, of the AMEGO Committee, and Jim Ray of Ray and Associates, and reading your editorial, I examined the issue of consolidation further, and would like to present this information to you in hopes that with better information, you will reconsider your support for consolidation. I realize that this is a politically charged issue hanging its hat on efficiencies, elimination of waste etc. but I hope that you will conclude, as I have, that consolidation will merely perpetuate the very things it was purported to eliminate.



I would like to summarize the points I intend to make regarding the issue of consolidation.

- 1) Consolidation or centralization is the absolutely wrong direction in which business and government should be moving according to contemporary organizational theory. The concept of centralization has been obsolete for nearly fifteen years and in general is counterproductive in achieving efficiencies.
- 2) The research conducted by the AMEGO Committee and Ray and Associates, though certainly well-intentioned, demonstrated neither internal nor external validity in documenting actual cost reductions for Travis County and/or City of Austin taxpayers by their consolidation proposals.
- 3) While popular sounding generalities such as "economies of scale," and "elimination of waste and duplication", concepts inherently popular with the electorate, were used as cost justifications for the consolidation proposal, the resultant implementation plans accomplished neither.
- 4) The current park operations in the county, and the methodologies used in that operation more closely reflect current organizational theory than do either the city or a consolidated program in a knowledge based economy.
- 5) Supposed economies of scale have overshadowed other important areas of efficiencies. The efficiencies gained due to the close working relationships between the Sheriff's Department, PITD, and the Parks Department cannot be overlooked. The efficiencies gained by taxpayers being able to directly contact a commissioner to whom the Parks Director directly reports is another important efficiency. The greater flexibility of a smaller organization to react and change is an efficiency.
- 6) Actual cost figures, where available, did not document cost savings. The total in-depth cost analysis needed to accurately analyze such a proposal was not completed. Particular attention needs to be given to cost behaviors if an accurate analysis is to be made. Whether costs are fixed, variable, incremental, etc., will impact on cost projections. Implementation of a plan based on generalizations and undocumented assumptions without adequate cost data support can result in the taxpayers getting the same service at an increased cost or incurring the same costs for reduced levels of service, the unwarranted loss of employment for county employees, and the undermining of county government which, if properly managed, has the flexible capacity and the flat structure requisite to perform most efficiently in an information based economy.



7. The study of consolidation has already cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in direct consulting dollars and in terms of staff time and indirect costs on the part of both the City of Austin and Travis County. Both organizations have cooperated fully and have been open to suggested changes and improvements. The process has not been without merit in that money saving ideas have been generated by the process and implemented. Those benefits, however, have already been recognized, and it is time to move on and to spend our very scarce resources on the more innovative modern organization theory concepts of smallness, reduction of bureaucracy, flexibility, ad hoc task forces, and knowledge-based information systems. The continued focus on obsolete theories of consolidation and centralization will only continue to erode the morale of the county employees who along with the taxpayers will bear the brunt of the increased costs of consolidation. Current dollars need to be spent on providing services and keeping pace with the demands of government in an information economy.

I conducted a review of some of the more contemporary business and management theories regarding centralization vs decentralization and have attached this review for your consideration. This is by no means intended to be all inclusive, but it will provide you with an overview of some of the contemporary thought regarding business organization.

Contemporary organizational thinkers recognize that this country has moved from the industrial economy to an information or knowledge based economy. This change has been driven by the technological leaps in computers and telecommunications in the past fifteen years. Organizations no longer need to be large enough to afford massive centralized mainframe computers or alternatively to have huge work forces to gather and evaluate data. Powerful relational database systems and PC's as well as a multitude of computer application packages are available at relatively low cost. Databases can be shared by small organizations thereby gaining the advantages of former "bigness" without the cumbersome and costly disadvantages. As Peter Drucker, America's foremost management authority, pointed out in his book The New Realities, "In an information-based society, bigness becomes a "function" and a dependent rather than an independent variable. In fact, the characteristics of information imply that the smallest effective size will be best. 'Bigger' will be 'better' only if the task cannot be done otherwise."



There has been no documentation provided by the AMEGO Committee that there is a problem that 'bigger' will solve. There has been no documentation that Travis County Parks, for instance, are not being maintained at the level dictated by the policies set by Commissioners' Court, the body elected to make those policy decisions. If there is an issue with these policies, the solution is for the electorate to provide input to their commissioners to initiate a policy change. This is not an efficiency problem corrected by consolidation.

Those supporting consolidation have been working on this thesis for roughly five years. In that time frame, they have yet to come up with numerical evidence to show that there are financial savings due to consolidation. They have not documented problems that would be addressed by the consolidation plans that they have recommended. They have implied economies of scale savings. They have discussed the advantages of governments doing joint planning, working together, and sharing knowledge. I share their enthusiasm for the later. In many areas such joint work is already being done successfully, and certainly the governments should endeavor to continue efforts in this direction. This would give the county the advantages of its small flexible size and also the advantages of more information and ideas. This is consistent with the thrust of current management literature and philosophy.

I would like to focus on economies of scale and the issues involved because this is the major benefit suggested from consolidation.

## ECONOMIES OF SCALE AND THE ASSUMPTIONS INVOLVED

## EXAMPLE

## Program X

	BIG	SMALL	TOTAL
Manager	\$ 50,000	\$35,000	\$85,000
Direct Laborers	100,000*	50,000**	150,000
Administrative Overhead***	22,500	12,750	35,250
Facilities Overhead	50,000	25,000	75,000
Total	\$222,500	\$122,750	\$345,250

\* 10 workers at \$10,000 each

\*\* 4 workers at \$10,0000

\*\*\* 15% of Labor Costs

Economies of scale are achieved by the elimination of "administrative and overhead costs" which are commonly termed duplicative.

## Scenario under those assumptions

	BIGGER	LITTLE	TOTAL
Manager	\$ 50,000	0	\$ 50,000
Direct Laborers	150,000	0	150,000
Administrative Overhead	22,500	0	22,500
Facilities Overhead	50,000	0	50,000
TOTAL	\$272,500	0	\$272,500

## Savings

Total prior to consolidation	\$345,250
Total after consolidation reflecting economies of scale	272,500
Savings	\$ 72,750



# ASSUMPTIONS IN SAVINGS DUE TO ECONOMIES OF SCALE

1) To measure and isolate economies of scale the level and quality of services must remain constant so that savings, if any, are attributable to "efficiencies" rather than from reductions of service levels. Changes in service levels is a separate issue.

2) All Costs of LITTLE will be eliminated.

a) The administrative overhead costs attributed to operation X by LITTLE are all assumed to be variable costs and, therefore, it is assumed that all costs are severable and can and will be eliminated.

## Typical composition of Administrative Overhead Costs

--salaries, supplies, equipment, space, insurance for space, utilities, etc. for

- accounting
- payroll
- human resource management
- risk management
- budget
- information systems
- administration--ie Commissioners Court

Reduction in administrative labor costs assumes that the time taken by LITTLE in program X consumed full-time FTE's in all administrative functions and that those positions could be eliminated at zero costs. If the labor costs took only partial FTE's such as 3 hours per week, there would be no cost reductions.

In terms of space and space related costs, it assumes that the space used for servicing program X could be eliminated and that utilities could be turned off and insurance costs no longer incurred.

It is assumed that LITTLE assumes NO functions for program X, and, therefore, incurs no costs and that it incurs no expenses in the termination of the manager.

If these assumptions are not true--the costs that Little incurred for administrative overhead are not eliminated. If Little incurs additional costs this will also reduce savings.

b) The facilities overhead costs of LITTLE attributed to program X are variable costs, are severable and can and will be eliminated.

Such costs are utilities  
insurance  
maintenance  
space

If this assumption is not true, LITTLE will not reduce its expenditures by \$50,000.

3) It is assumed that the span of control for this type of work can be increased by 50% and that BIGGER'S manager is able and willing to assume the additional responsibilities involved for no increase in pay. If the span of control is too large, an assistant manager or another manager will need to be hired. If additional compensation has to be given to the manager, this could increase BIGGER's costs even further.

4) It is assumed that BIG has excess capacity in terms of administrative services and overhead and facilities overhead and that there are no incremental costs. If this is not true, then additional administrative people may have to be hired and additional overhead costs will have to be incurred.



## Scenario under those assumptions

	BIGGER	LITTLE	TOTAL
Manager	\$ 62,500	0	\$ 62,500
Direct Laborers	150,000	0	150,000
Administrative Overhead	35,250	12,750	48,000
Facilities Overhead	75,000	25,000	100,000
Assistant Manager	20,000	0	20,000
Unemployment	0	5,642	5,642
 TOTAL	 \$342,750	 43,392	 386,142

## Savings

Total prior to consolidation	\$345,250
Total after consolidation	
reflecting economies of scale	386,142
	-----
ADDITIONAL COSTS	\$ 40,892

Program X now costs \$40,892 per year MORE than it did prior to consolidation.

## PARKS CONSOLIDATION

## PARKS

## Costs to Maintain Current Service Levels and Current Administrative Activities

	CITY	COUNTY
Administrative Functions to remain with the County		\$ 121,156
Direct Costs for current service levels	\$1,221,454	
Unemployment costs		50,778
Other costs to remain with the County		19,600
Consulting Fees-Ray & Associates	50,000	50,000
Sub-total	\$1,271,454	\$ 241,534
-----		
Combined Consolidation Total Costs prior to Consolidation	\$1,512,988	
	<u>1,274,543</u>	
Subtotal of ADDITIONAL first year costs	238,445	
Administrative and Facilities Overhead Reduction to County		-0-
Additional Overhead Incurred by City	?	
RIF paid by County to 9 employees for 90 days		74,957



Other issues concerning Parks consolidation that could have a financial impact

- 1) Since the County retirement benefits cannot be directly transferred into the City retirement system, AMEGO suggested that the current Park employees remain on the County Payroll.

Issues--

A) Who is responsible for unemployment benefits--the County is self insured, so one lump sum is budgeted annually? The County will not be supervising Parks personnel and yet the county could have financial liability for unemployment. Who defends employment related suits--the County Attorney or the City Attorney. Who gives personnel advise with regard to personnel problems which could result in litigation.

B) Who is responsible for workers compensation claims? The employees will not be supervised by County employees. The County is self-insured. If the County is responsible, who defends in litigation--the County Attorney or the City Attorney.

C) If the County is responsible for workers compensation claims, what input will the County have on establishing safety standards?

- 2) The contract suggested by AMEGO provided that the equipment be purchased by the County and repaired with County labor. Parts are to be provided by the City.

Issues--

A) If there is a third party injury involving the equipment, who assumes the liability for the injuries. Who handles and pays for the litigation.

B) Who determines the maintenance schedules. On page 6 of the contract it states that the city will provide the county a schedule of proposed capital equipment replacement by July 1991 and update their schedule by July 1. Who draws up the specifications for replacement, who bears the costs of the bidding process. What if the city's capital replacement plan is incongruent with the county's overall capital replacement plan?

C) Some maintenance modes are labor intensive and some are equipment intensive. The County parks are geographically farther apart than are City parks. The City maintenance modes which tend to move people freely between parks may increase costs if transportation and the related equipment and labor downtime is factored in. This needs to be carefully analyzed before jumping to any conclusions involving efficiencies. It is possible that there are savings, but it is also possible that increased transportation costs, labor downtime while employees are riding in vehicles rather than performing maintenance services as well as the increased liabilities resulting from operating vehicles may actually increase costs. This entire area was ignored by the Amego Report.

3) The contract suggested by Amego retains three positions at the County. Page 7 of the Amego Implementation Report outlines the duties of these positions. The report also says "These employees should be transitioned to the city or phased out not later than October 1, 1993." The duties that these three employees retain are significant. The assumption in the report is that these people can be phased out and that these duties can be absorbed by the city at no additional costs. This assumption must be carefully evaluated. A cost estimate should be obtained from the city as to what they would charge for assuming those services. It seems somewhat inconsistent that the Report recommends phasing out all positions at the County but at the same time recommends on page 3 of the contract that "City and county agree that each governing body will designate sufficient professional staff to a city-county Parks Master Plan Team and will equally share in the necessary financial support of the team in order for the team to develop a county-wide Parks Master Team Plan by December 9, 1991. The report also says "The Plan, as it may be amended or approved by the governing bodies, will be implemented and updated as necessary by the team. By action of each governing body, the city and county agree to designate specific professional and support employees to serve on the team and to agree to upon a team leader. The team leader shall request time on the agenda of the city council, the commissioners court, and the Lower Colorado River Authority at least once each quarter to report to each respective governing body on the status of the team's work." This suggests an ongoing team of professionals from each body to serve on this team. If all members of the county parks administrative staff are phased out, who will be knowledgeable enough and have the time to serve on this team from the county? Is the implication that the county will have no further input into parks planning after October 1, 1993 when the administrative phaseout is scheduled? What is the cost of the "financial support" of this team? Why can this team not be created under the current park structure if it is a valid approach for improved park services? Are there actual financial benefits from this team or is this just another layer of bureaucracy?



4) On page 4 of the contract, Item 12 reads

"City and county agree that city costs to provide park operations and maintenance services to the county include all personnel, administrative services, supplies, materials, equipment, and contract labor, if any necessary to perform the services. City costs do not include facility construction; replacement of facilities or major facilities repairs; security services; road and bridge construction, maintenance, repair, or replacement; or the labor costs to repair county owned vehicles in the city's possession." Who will manage these responsibilities for the county after the administrative phaseout? What will be the cost of that administration. Given County Commissioners are responsible for putting park bonds issues on the ballot and are responsible to the county voters for the county parks and the accounting for the proceeds of the those bond issues, who on the County staff will be responsible for these activities and what will be the cost?

Brief Review of Current Management Literature

Thriving on Chaos, Tom Peters, Harper and Row Publishers, 1987

p.18 with regard to Japanese success

"One such focuses on the unique, age-old Japanese passion for smallness, in a world where the advantages of smallness seem to be fast eclipsing the once generally perceived value of giantism."

p. 20

"The new market realities demand flexibility and speed. The new technologies permit their achievement--but only if we turn our backs decisively on our love affair with size and its handmaidens, stability and predictability. And a useful step in weaning ourselves from the obsession with size might be to recognize that it has never yielded the promised results. 'Bigness has not delivered the goods, and this fact is no longer a secret.' With these words economist Walter Adams(a former president of Michigan State University) and James Brock launch their 1986 book The Bigness Complex. After reviewing hundreds of studies, they conclude: 'Scientific evidence has not been kind to the apostles of bigness and to their mythology.'"

p. 20

"In fact, astute observers of the industrial landscape have been questioning the efficiency of bigness for decades."

p. 21

Regarding General Motors

"There are so many people involved and it requires a tremendous effort to put something new into effect that a new idea is likely to be considered insignificant in comparison with the effort that it takes to put it across."

"In a classic 1956 study, economist Joe Bain examined the cost advantages flowing to multi-plant, as opposed to single-plant, firms in twenty industries. In no case was owning more than one plant a major advantage."

"THE MOVEMENT TOWARD EFFICIENCY THROUGH SMALLNESS IS ACCELERATING IN VIRTUALLY EVERY INDUSTRY TODAY"



p.22

"More sweeping evidence comes from US News and World Report's year-end analysis for 1986. It attributes much of the productive vitality of the Los Angeles Basin-population about 13 million-to the astonishing fact that "some 90 percent of those employed in the ...area work in small firms with fewer than 50 people that can change course fast to stay competitive."

p. 23 "After efficiency, the second advantage of bigness touted by its advocates has been innovativeness....."Reality and the available evidence show that despite all these theoretical advantages, small firms...are far more efficient innovators than industrial giants...small firms are more prolific inventors than giant companies; small firms exert significantly greater research and development effort than large ones; small firms devise and develop inventions at substantially lower costs than large firms; and the giant organizations seem to suffer a number of debilitating and apparently endemic disadvantages as regards invention and innovations."

p. 25

"The point here is simply this: What has been the most venerated tradition in American economics, or, indeed, the American psyche-that big is good; bigger is better; biggest is best-isn't so. It wasn't so. And it surely won't be so in the future."

p. 28

"Today's and tomorrow's winning hand is becoming increasingly clear--quality and flexibility. Essential to both are (1) smaller units and (2) highly skilled workers serving as the chief source of incremental improvements in products and services."

p. 34

"Take all the evidence together, and a clear picture of the successful firm in the 1990s and beyond emerges. It will be:

- > flatter(have fewer layers of organization structure)
- > populated by more autonomous units(have fewer central staff second-guessers, more local authority to introduce and to price products)
- > oriented toward differentiation, producing high value-added goods and services, creating niche markets
- > quality conscious
- > service conscious
- > more responsive
- > much faster at innovation
- > a user of highly trained, flexible people as the principal means of adding value

p. 427

"My co-authors and I downplayed the importance of structure in In Search of Excellence and again in A Passion for Excellence. We were terribly mistaken. Good intentions and brilliant proposals will be deadened, delayed, sabotaged, massaged to death, or revised beyond recognition or usefulness by the over-layered structures at most large and all too many smaller firms."

p.427

"Almost seventy-five years ago, DuPont created what may have been the first modern divisionalized organization structure, with separate units containing all the functions necessary to do business (R & D, engineering, purchasing, manufacturing, distribution, sales). General Motors soon followed suit. It has been estimated that between the end of World War II and 1970, 90 percent of the Fortune 500 decentralized into divisional structures.

Decentralization was the right strategy--it still is. But the "clean" businessminded structures envisioned by the pioneers lost their zip over time, and success didn't help. Many decentralized units grew big, with some divisions encumbered by ten or more layers of management.

But worse was to come. The 'operations research paradigm' appeared during World War II; optimization of everything (e.g. manufacturing, engineering) became the cry. The optimizer is by definition a centralizer, a hyper-organizer. Function after function--purchasing, for example--was defacto recentralized at such companies as GM, despite the nominal retention (on paper) of the decentralized divisional structure. ...Each development, sensible in itself, fostered the further growth of expert central staffs. Each central staff addition meant (1) more requests to the line for reports, and (2) more requests that this or that report be coordinated with numerous others; moreover, each staff was increasingly requested to coordinate almost everything with every other central staff. The mess (and the resultant inertia) increased exponentially.

To deal with this mess, still more layers and "offices of" were added--the idea of the group executive, the office of the chairman; and each of these in turn developed private staffs (1) to consolidate their power and (2) to deal professionally with the queries of other staffs."



p. 453

"Quick response to perpetual turmoil is now a competitive necessity. People's involvement, commitment, and empowerment, in turn, are the keys to speedy organizational action. Training, team configuration, reduced structure, and new roles for middle managers aid speedy action-taking. ...Campaigns against bureaucracy must become strategic priorities of the first order."

Megatrends, John Naisbitt, 1985, Morrow, NY

Trends that were shaping the 1980's

1. Industrial Society > to Information Society
2. Forced Technology > to High Tech/High Touch
3. National Economy > to World Economy
4. Short Term > to Long Term
5. Centralization > to Decentralization
6. Institutional Help > to Self-Help
7. Representative Democracy > to Participatory Democracy
8. Hierarchies > to Networking
9. North > to South
10. Either/Or > to Multiple Options

Megatrends 2000, John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene, Morrow, 1990, NY

p. 23

"Telecommunications-and-computers-will continue to drive change, just as manufacturing did during the industrial period."

p. 48

"It will require a tremendous human resource effort to transform corporate America into the decentralized, customer-oriented model of the information society. Yet that is what is needed for the United States to participate fully in the booming global economy."

p. 94

RE: demise of classical socialism

3. The failure of centralization. The lack of any successful centrally planned economies has finally been acknowledged. ...It is clear to just about everyone that the decentralized, entrepreneurial, market-driven model is everywhere more successful."

The New Realities, Peter Drucker, Harper & Row, 1989, NY

p. 66

"Government will malperform if an activity is under pressure to satisfy different constituencies with different values and different demands. Performance requires concentration on one goal. It requires setting priorities and sticking to them."

p. 68

"Whatever non-governmental organizations can do better, or can do just as well, should not be done by government...One way is privatization. Another way is to switch from government as a doer to government as the provider, with the work being done by outside contractors to government-set standards."

p. 207

"The typical large organization, such as a large business or a government agency, twenty years hence will have no more than half the levels of management of its counterparts today, and no more than a third the number of "managers"...the business, and increasingly the government agency as well, will be knowledge based, composed largely of specialists who direct and discipline their own performance through organized feedback from colleagues and customers. It will be an information based organization. Large organizations will have little choice but to become information-based. Demographics, for one, demands the shift. The center of gravity in employment is moving fast from manual and clerical workers to knowledge workers who resist the command-and-control model that business took from the military one hundred years ago.

p.208

As soon, however, as an organization takes the first tentative steps from data to information, its decision processes, management structure, and the way its work gets done begin to be transformed."



p. 209

"The second area that is affected when an organization focuses its data-processing capacity on producing information is its structure. Almost immediately, it becomes clear that both the number of management levels and the number of managers can be sharply cut....Information data is endowed with relevance and purpose. Converting data into information thus requires knowledge. And knowledge, by definition, is specialized. (In fact, truly knowledgeable people tend toward overspecialization because there is always so much more to know.) The information-based organization requires far more specialists overall than does the command-and-control structure we are accustomed to.

p. 216

"The information-based organization poses new management problems. I see as particularly critical:

- > Developing rewards, recognition, and career opportunities for specialists
- > Creating unified vision in an organization of specialists
- > Devising the management structure for an organization of task forces
- > Ensuring the supply, preparation, and testing of top management people

p. 218

"A business, a government agency, a hospital, cannot function this way." ( Meaning acting in isolation.) "It requires that the view of the whole and a focus on the whole be shared among a great many professional specialists, certainly among the senior ones. Yet it will have to accept and even foster, the pride and professionalism of its specialists-if only because the motivation must come from that pride and professionalism in the absence of opportunity to move into middle management. One way to provide a view of the whole, of course, is through work in cross functional task forces. The information-based organization will use more and smaller self-governing units, assigning them tasks tidy enough for 'a good man to get his arms around,' as the old phrase has it. "

p. 219

"Decentralization into autonomous units will surely be even more critical than it is now."

p. 259

"The question of the right size for a given task or a given organization will become a central challenge. Greater performance in a mechanical system is obtained by scaling up...."

p. 260

"In an information-based society, bigness becomes a "function" and a dependent rather than an independent variable. In fact the characteristics of information imply that the smallest effective size will be best. 'Bigger' will be 'better' only if the task cannot be done otherwise.

For communication to be effective there has to be both information and meaning. And meaning requires communication. If somebody whose language I do not speak calls me on the telephone, it doesn't help me at all that the connection is crystal clear. There is no 'meaning' unless I understand the language-the message the meteorologist understands perfectly is gibberish to a chemist. Communion, however, does not work well if the group is very large. It requires constant reaffirmation. It requires the ability to interpret. It requires a community.....

For fifty years, from the early days of the Great Depression to the 1970's, the trend ran toward centralization and bigness. Prior to 1929, doctors did not put their paying patients into hospitals except for surgery. Very few babies before the 1920s were born in hospitals; the majority were born at home. The dynamics of higher education in the United States as late as the 1930s were in the small and medium-size liberal arts colleges. After World War II they shifted increasingly to the big university and to the even bigger 'research university.' The same thing happened in government. And after World War II bigness became an obsession in business. Every firm had to be a 'billion-dollar corporation.'

In the seventies the tide turned. No longer is it the mark of good government to be bigger.... We have moved away from the worship of size that characterized the first three quarters of the century and especially the immediate post-World War II period. We are rapidly restructuring and 'divesting' big business. We are, especially in the United States, pushing governmental tasks away from the center and toward local government in the country. We are 'privatizing' and farming out governmental tasks, especially in the local community to small outside contractors.



Increasingly, therefore, the question of the right size for a task will be a central one. Is this task best done by a bee, hummingbird, a mouse, deer, or an elephant? All of them are needed, but each for a different task and in a different ecology. This right size will increasingly be whatever handles most effectively the information needed for task and function. Where the traditional organization was held together by command and control, the 'skeleton' of the information-based organization will be the optimum information system."

Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Peter F. Drucker, Harper & Row, 1985, NY

From the Chapter "Entrepreneurship in the Service Institution".

p. 177

"Public service institutions such as government agencies, labor unions, churches, universities, and schools, hospitals, community and charitable organizations, professional and trade associations and the like, need to be entrepreneurial and innovative fully as much as any business does. Indeed, they may need it more. The rapid changes in today's society, technology, and economy are simultaneously an even greater threat to them and an even greater opportunity....To be sure, every service institution like to get bigger. In the absence of a profit test, size is one criterion of success for the service institution, and growth a goal in itself."

Relevance Lost, The Rise and Fall of Management Accounting; H. Thomas Johnson and Robert S. Kaplan, Harvard Business School Press, Mass., 1987.

p. 206

"Smaller organizations that may be conducting a higher fraction of transactions in the marketplace than within the hierarchy--for example, small steel mills that purchase already processed raw materials, such as scrap, rather than produce steel starting from raw materials--become more efficient than giant enterprises that attempt to manage complex conversion processes with inadequate information. Also, more focused enterprises will compete by concentrating on a narrow product line or range of internally managed activities....Focused organizations will become highly efficient in their narrow product segments or range of productive processes and will outperform diversified organizations that no longer can assess the relative profitability of their varied, frequently unrelated activities. WHATEVER SCALE ECONOMIES LARGE DIVERSIFIED ENTERPRISES ATTEMPT TO ACHIEVE THROUGH CENTRALIZED FINANCING OR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES WILL BE DISSIPATED BY THEIR INABILITY TO RESPOND TO COMPETITIVE PRESSURES FROM SIMPLER MORE FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS."



## Bibliography

Drucker, Peter F., Management (Harper & Row Publishers; New York, N.Y.; 1973)

Drucker, Peter F., The New Realities (Harper & Row; New York, N.Y.; 1989)

Drucker, Peter F., Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Harper and Row; New York, N.Y.; 1985)

Kaplan, Robert S. and Johnson, Thomas, Relevance Lost, The Rise and Fall of Management Accounting (Harvard Business School Press; Cambridge, Massachusetts; 1987)

Naisbitt, John, Megatrends (Morrow; New York, N.Y.; 1985)

Naisbitt, John and Aburdene, Patricia, Megatrends 2000 (Morrow; New York, N.Y.; 1990)

Peters, Thomas and Waterman, Robert H., In Search of Excellence (Warner Books; New York, N.Y.; 1982)

Peters, Thomas and Austin, Nancy, A Passion for Excellence (Warner Books; New York, N.Y.; 1985)

Peters, Thomas, Thriving on Chaos (Harper and Row; New York, N.Y.; 1987)

Thomas, William E., Readings in Cost Accounting, Budgeting and Control, (Southwestern Publishing Co.; Cincinnati, Ohio; 1978)



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Council Members

FROM: Alicia Perez, Assistant City Manager

DATE: August 17, 1990

SUBJECT: AMEGO Cost Analysis


Attached is the cost analysis on City of Austin maintenance of County and L.C.R.A. parks which I have transmitted to the County Commissioners. This analysis includes four scenarios. I emphasize throughout the report that these cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change contingent on: (1) County budget negotiations and policy decisions, and (2) actual contract negotiations on levels of services, capital equipment needs and full cost recovery to the City.

The preliminary cost estimates in the analysis are based on two budgets, the amended 1989-90 and the 1990-91 departmental requested budget for the County Parks Department. It also includes City indirect costs. At the time of the analysis, we did not have the County's proposed 1990-91 budget which would provide us with information on what the County Budget Office is recommending as an acceptable level of service and the costs related to that level. That information would allow us to better determine the true cost of consolidation.

Also attached for your information, are reports from Travis County's Budget and Research Department on budget reductions in the County Parks Department and a memorandum from The County's Public Improvements and Transportation Department (PITD) on the consolidation of the Parks Department and PITD.

I am willing to discuss this analysis with you on an individual basis. I also offer our assistance in the further development of a proposal for consolidation, if that is the will of the City and County Officials.

If you have any questions please let me know.

  
Alicia Perez  
Assistant City Manager





# City of Austin

Founded by Congress, Republic of Texas, 1839

Municipal Building, Eighth at Colorado, P.O. Box 1086, Austin, Texas 78767 Telephone: 512-499-2000

August 14, 1950

Travis County Commissioners  
Travis County Courthouse Annex  
P.O. Box 1748, Room 206  
Austin, Texas 78767

Dear Commissioners,

Attached is the cost analysis you requested on City of Austin maintenance of County and L.C.R.A. parks. This analysis includes four scenarios for your consideration.

This is a stand-alone cost analysis and does not provide a comparative analysis with other proposals you will be receiving from your staff. I will be available to brief you individually and answer any questions you may have on the analysis.

Please express my appreciation to your County Parks staff. Their patience and understanding has been admirable and they have been extremely open and responsive to our requests.

I look forward to continuing to work with you in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Alicia Perez".

Alicia Perez  
Assistant City Manager



# City of Austin

Founded by Congress, Republic of Texas, 1839

Municipal Building, Eighth at Colorado, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78767 Telephone 312-499-2000

August 14, 1990

Honorable Judge Bill Aleshire  
& Travis County Commissioners  
Travis County Courthouse Annex  
P.O. Box 1748, Room 206  
Austin, Texas, 78767

Honorable Judge and County Commissioners:

To determine the cost to Travis County of contracting with the City of Austin to maintain County and LCRA parks, City staff met with County staff on several occasions. As a result of these meetings the City of Austin is providing preliminary cost estimates of four scenarios for your consideration.

The cost of these alternatives described below cannot be compared to the ANSCO Committee Proposal, the County Parks Department's proposal for reduced services, or my proposal from the Travis County Public Improvements and Transportation Department until: (1) the full cost of the Travis County's current service is available, and (2) an impartial party has all of the proposals assembled and time to determine which cost items are included in, or excluded, from each proposal. We consider these numbers preliminary because they would be subject to adjustment contingent on: 1) County budget negotiations and policy decisions, and (2) actual contract negotiation on levels of services, capital equipment needs and full cost recovery for the City.

All of the scenarios include the following assumptions, in addition to those outlined with each scenario;

- The County retains their Parks Administrator and a half-time secretarial position along with associated operational costs. These positions would provide contract administration for the County, including the City-County contract and the County-LCRA contract. In addition, the Parks Administrator would act as liaison responding to requests for information and assistance to the Commissioners Court, City Council and City and County residents.
- The County Park's Planner would be integrated into the City Parks Department Planning & Design Division and would be responsible for the management of County CIP projects. The County Planner will also participate in the County-wide parks master plan as funding is made available.
- A 15% administrative overhead charge has been included as a standard indirect cost allocation of the City Parks and Recreation Department for services provided to the County in this contract.



The County retains the funding and responsibility for the maintenance and repair of trucks, tractors and other heavy motorized equipment, including parts, labor and fuel.

Scenario I

The cost for this scenario was developed using the following assumptions in addition to those outlined above:

- The 1989-90 amended budget for the County Parks Department was used as a starting point for this analysis.

- This analysis maintains the County and L.C.R.A. parks at the current maintenance level provided by the County Parks Department.

- There are no additional capital equipment purchases included.

- This provides no enhancements or expansion of service levels.

The total cost for this scenario is \$1,367,005 as outlined in Attachment I.

Scenario II also uses:

- the County Parks Department's 1989-90 amended budget as a benchmark;

- but provides for a reduction of seven FTIs and the associated operational costs. This would result in the elimination of league play in the softball program and hence eliminate duplication of services already provided by the City's softball program. In addition maintenance (e.g. mowing frequencies, litter removal and fence maintenance) at County and a LCRA parks would be reduced comparable to City maintenance levels.

The cost for this scenario is \$1,083,525 as detailed in Attachment II.

Both Scenario III & IV use:

- The County Park's Department 1990-91 departmental requested budget (as of August 8, 1990), excluding proposed program enhancements of \$98,913. This includes \$42,538 for seasonal security at Tom Hughes Park, seasonal funding for newly developed CIP projects at Tabberville and Windy Point Park, \$10,000 for security lighting at Loop 360, \$10,000 for composting toilets at Hamilton Pool and \$36,375 for new capital equipment. The departmental requested budget was used, as the actual proposed budget was not available when this analysis was developed in these scenarios.

In addition Scenario IV assumes a reduction of seven FTEs and the associated operational costs. This would result in the elimination of league play in the softball program and hence eliminate duplication of services already provided by the City's softball program. Maintenance (e.g. moving frequencies, litter removal and fence maintenance) at County and a LCRA parks would be reduced to comparable City maintenance levels.

The cost of Scenario III is \$1,727,704, while Scenario IV costs \$1,435,177. These scenarios are outlined in Attachments III and IV.

#### Other Issues

In the development of this preliminary cost analysis other issues arose which would have cost and policy implications and would need to be addressed in further contract negotiations. The following issues were reviewed by the City Attorney. The City's position on each is outlined below.

#### Potential Liability for Personal Injury and Property Damage

The City Attorney advises that liabilities for personal injury and property damage existing by virtue of maintenance and operation of County facilities by the City would be covered by the Interlocal Cooperation Act (V.A.T.S. Art. 4413 (32c)). This Act would be authority for specifying that employees (whether on County or City payrolls) performing services on County parks or facilities would be deemed agents of Travis County and the County would therefore be liable.

#### Workers Compensation

In any arrangement whereby the City would supervise County employees, the City would be responsible for Workers Compensation benefits, notwithstanding the fact that County employees would be on the County's payroll. The City therefore would desire that a separate Workers Compensation policy for County employees be secured, if available, and costs charged to the County as a part of this contract. This cost has not been determined at this time.

#### Personnel Transition

The City recommends that the County retain their employees on their payroll and under their benefits coverage. The employees would be supervised and directed by City staff. Under City of Austin supervision, the employees would be governed by City personnel policies.



As vacancies occur in the County's Parks work unit they would be transferred to the City. The City's Parks Department will fill the vacancies under the City's pay structure and provide City benefits. The costs associated with each position would be charged back to the County.

City staff has presented to you preliminary costs estimates based on two budgets, the amended 1989-90 and the 1990-91 departmental requested budget for the County Parks Department. At this time we do not have the proposed 1990-91 budget which would provide us with information on what your Budget Office is recommending as an acceptable level of service and the costs related to that level. That information would allow us to better determine the true cost of consolidation.

I am willing to discuss this analysis with the Commissioners on an individual basis. I also offer our assistance in the further development of a proposal for consolidation, if that is the will of the County and City Officials.

I appreciate the opportunity to be of assistance.

Sincerely,



Alicia Perez  
Assistant City Manager

Attachment I - Current Budget FY 1989-90

LCRA Parks	Permanent FTE's	Permanent Salaries	Temp./Sec. FTE's	Temp./Sec. Salaries	Oper- ations	Replacement Capital	Total Amended Budget*
1 Arkansas Bend	0.61	11,789	0.00	\$0	\$2,503		\$14,292
2 Cypress Creek	0.11	43,078	1.01	\$14,002	\$9,145		\$66,225
3 Hippie Hollow	1.91	56,700	1.88	\$27,062	\$12,037		\$95,799
4 Mansfield Dam	5.51	74,244	1.44	\$20,003	\$15,761		\$110,007
5 Pace Bend	4.11	93,854	2.21	\$30,671	\$19,924		\$144,448
6 Sandy Creek	0.61	11,789	0.00	\$0	\$2,503		\$14,292
7 Windy Point/Rodberg	2.91	67,182	1.44	\$25,834	\$14,262		\$107,278
Planning/Design	0.40	15,388			\$3,267		\$18,655
Ops. Manager	0.60	24,211			\$5,140		\$29,351
Administration	1.00	27,077			\$5,748		\$32,825
Replacement Capital					\$0	\$35,438	\$35,438
- Pace Bend ERS/Fire					\$10,000		\$10,000
<b>Sub-Total LCRA Parks</b>	<b>17.74</b>	<b>\$425,313</b>	<b>7.98</b>	<b>\$117,570</b>	<b>\$100,289</b>	<b>\$35,438</b>	<b>\$678,610</b>
<b>County Parks</b>							
8 Allen	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
9 Dink Pearson	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
10 Fritz Hughes	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
11 Hamilton Pool	2.11	47,831	0.87	\$12,002	\$10,154		\$69,986
12 Loop 360 Boat Ramp	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
13 Mary Guinlan	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
14 Richard Moya	3.11	78,737	0.00	\$0	\$16,715		\$95,451
15 Selma Hughes	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
16 Del Valle/Moya Fields	3.11	73,305	0.87	\$12,002	\$15,362		\$100,868
17 Tom Hughes	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$7,471	\$470		\$10,153
18 Webberville	3.11	72,798	0.29	\$4,001	\$15,454		\$92,252
19 Windmill Run	0.11	2,213	0.00	\$0	\$470		\$2,682
20 Manor	0.00	0	0.00	\$0	\$0		\$0
Planning/Design	0.60	23,083			\$4,900		\$27,983
Ops. Manager	0.40	16,141			\$3,427		\$19,568
Administration	1.00	27,077			\$5,748		\$32,825
Capital						\$30,112	\$30,112
- Wild Basin					\$20,000		\$20,000
- Brush Country					\$72,800		\$72,800
<b>Sub-Total County Parks</b>	<b>14.26</b>	<b>\$336,672</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>\$35,475</b>	<b>\$168,517</b>	<b>\$30,112</b>	<b>\$590,776</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>32.00</b>	<b>\$781,984</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>\$153,045</b>	<b>\$268,806</b>	<b>\$65,550</b>	<b>\$1,269,385</b>
					<b>Indirect Costs</b>		<b>\$97,620</b>
							<b>\$1,367,005</b>

\* \$1,340,093 was originally approved for 1989-90, budget amendments totaling \$13,302 were approved by the County Commissioners for seasonal security at Tom Hughes and Windy Point.



Attachment II - Deletions to Current Level of Service FY 1989-90

Assumes maintenance levels will be the same as at City Parks.

	Total Basic Budget	Softball Comparable Program Reduction	Service Level	Total Proposed Budget
<b>LCRA Parks</b>				
1 Arkansas Bend	\$14,292		(\$1,484)	\$12,808
2 Cypress Creek	\$66,225		(\$10,389)	\$55,836
3 Hippie Hollow	\$95,799		(\$13,358)	\$82,441
4 Mansfield Dam	\$10,007		(\$29,876)	\$80,132
5 Pace Bend	\$144,448		(\$29,876)	\$114,573
6 Sandy Creek	\$14,292		(\$1,484)	\$12,808
7 Windy Point/Rosberg	\$107,278		(\$10,326)	\$96,952
Planning/Design	\$18,655			\$18,655
Ops. Manager	\$29,351			\$29,351
Administration	\$32,825			\$0
Capital	\$35,438			\$35,438
- Pace Bend EPS/Fire	\$10,000			\$10,000
<b>Sub-Total LCRA Parks</b>	<b>\$678,610</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$96,793)</b>	<b>\$581,817</b>
<b>County Parks</b>				
8 Allen	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
9 Dink Pearson	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
10 Fritz Hughes	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
11 Hamilton Pool	\$69,986		(\$1,484)	\$68,502
12 Loop 360 Sport Ramp	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
13 Mary Guinlan	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
14 Richard Moya	\$95,451	(\$10,000)	(\$45,720)	\$35,732
15 Selma Hughes	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
16 Del Valle/Moya Fields	\$100,868	(\$31,872)	(\$1,484)	\$67,512
17 Tom Hughes	\$10,153		(\$1,484)	\$8,669
18 Webberville	\$92,252		(\$1,484)	\$90,768
19 Windmill Run	\$2,682		(\$1,484)	\$1,198
20 Manor	\$0			\$0
Planning/Design	\$27,983			\$27,983
Ops. Manager	\$19,568			\$19,568
Administration	\$32,826			\$0
Replacement Capital	\$30,112			\$30,112
- Wild Basin	\$20,000			\$20,000
- Brush Country - "	\$72,800			\$72,800
<b>Sub-Total County Parks</b>	<b>\$590,776</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$62,046)</b>	<b>\$486,858</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,269,385</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$158,838)</b>	<b>\$1,074,675</b>
		<b>Indirect Costs</b>		<b>\$2,501</b>
				<b>\$1,077,176</b>

Attachment III - Departmental Requested Budget 1990-91

- Maintains the County's current level of service

	Permanent FTE's	Permanent Salaries	Temp./Sea. FTE's	Temp./Sea. Salaries	Oper- ations	Replacement Capital	Total Budget
<b>LCRA Parks</b>							
1 Arkansas Bend	0.61	12,018	0.18	\$2,633	\$4,330		\$18,982
2 Cypress Creek	0.11	43,800	0.49	\$7,069	\$15,781		\$66,650
3 Mippie Hollow	1.91	57,650	1.37	\$20,224	\$20,770		\$98,643
4 Blackfield Dam	5.51	75,420	1.01	\$11,553	\$27,173		\$117,146
5 Pace Bend	4.11	95,409	2.60	\$37,423	\$34,374		\$167,207
6 Sandy Creek	0.61	12,018	0.19	\$2,772	\$4,330		\$19,121
7 Windy Point/Rosberg	2.91	68,283	2.88	\$41,511	\$24,601		\$134,396
Planning/Design	0.40	15,540			\$5,599		\$21,139
Ops. Manager	0.60	24,439			\$8,805		\$33,243
Administration	1.00	27,457			\$9,892		\$37,349
Replacement Capital						\$175,850	\$175,850
- Pace Bend EHS/Fire					\$10,000		\$10,000
<b>Sub-Total LCRA Parks</b>	<b>17.74</b>	<b>\$432,035</b>	<b>8.72</b>	<b>\$126,185</b>	<b>\$165,655</b>	<b>\$175,850</b>	<b>\$899,725</b>
<b>County Parks</b>							
8 Allen	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
9 Dink Pearson	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
10 Fritz Hughes	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
11 Hamilton Pool	2.11	48,628	1.15	\$16,632	\$17,520		\$82,781
12 Loop 360 Boat Ramp	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
13 Mary Quinlan	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
14 Richard Moya	3.11	79,915	0.54	\$7,762	\$28,792		\$116,468
15 Selma Hughes	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$812		\$3,064
16 Del Valle/Moya Fields	3.11	74,481	0.54	\$7,762	\$25,834		\$109,077
17 Tom Hughes	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$811		\$3,063
18 Webberville	3.11	73,972	0.48	\$6,930	\$25,651		\$107,553
19 Windmill Run	0.11	2,252	0.00	\$0	\$811		\$3,063
20 Manor	0.00	0	0.00	\$0	\$0		\$0
Planning/Design	0.60	23,310			\$8,398		\$31,708
Ops. Manager	0.40	16,252			\$5,870		\$22,162
Administration	1.00	27,457			\$9,892		\$37,349
Capital						\$105,950	\$105,950
- Wild Basin					\$20,000		\$20,000
- Brush Country					\$72,800		\$72,800
<b>Sub-Total County Parks</b>	<b>14.26</b>	<b>\$362,073</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>\$39,086</b>	<b>\$223,249</b>	<b>\$105,950</b>	<b>\$730,358</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>32.00</b>	<b>\$794,108</b>	<b>11.43</b>	<b>\$165,271</b>	<b>\$388,904</b>	<b>\$281,800</b>	<b>\$1,630,084</b>
					Indirect Costs		\$97,620
							\$1,727,704

\* - Operations dollar amounts for the Proposed Budget include line item transfers of \$115,550, which ordinarily would be budgeted in other County departments to support Parks operations.



Attachment IV - Deletions to Current Level of Service FY 1990/91  
Assumes maintenance levels will be the same as at City Parks.

	Total Basic Budget	Softball Comparable Program Reduction	Service Level	Total Proposed Budget
<b>LCRA Parks</b>				
1 Arkansas Bend	\$18,982		(\$1,484)	\$17,498
2 Cypress Creek	\$66,650		(\$10,389)	\$56,260
3 Hippie Hollow	\$98,643		(\$13,358)	\$85,285
4 Mansfield Dam	\$117,146		(\$29,876)	\$87,270
5 Pace Bend	\$167,207		(\$29,876)	\$137,331
6 Sandy Creek	\$19,121		(\$1,484)	\$17,636
7 Windy Point/Iceberg	\$134,396		(\$10,326)	\$124,070
Planning/Design	\$21,139			\$21,139
Ops. Manager	\$33,243			\$33,243
Administration	\$37,349			\$0
Capital	\$175,850			\$175,850
- Pace Bend EMS/Fire	\$10,000			\$10,000
<b>Sub-Total LCRA Parks</b>	<b>\$899,725</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$96,793)</b>	<b>\$765,584</b>
<b>County Parks</b>				
8 Allen	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
9 Dink Pearson	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
10 Fritz Hughes	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
11 Hamilton Pool	\$82,781		(\$1,484)	\$81,297
12 Loop 360 Boat Ramp	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
13 Mary Quinlan	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
14 Richard Moya	\$116,468	(\$10,000)	(\$45,722)	\$60,748
15 Selma Hughes	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
16 Del Valle/Moya Fields	\$109,077	(\$31,872)	(\$1,484)	\$75,721
17 Tom Hughes	\$3,063		(\$1,484)	\$1,579
18 Webberville	\$107,553		(\$1,484)	\$106,069
19 Winzell Run	\$3,063		(\$1,484)	\$1,579
20 Manor	\$0			\$0
Planning/Design	\$31,708			\$31,708
Ops. Manager	\$22,162			\$22,162
Administration	\$37,349			\$0
Replacement Capital	\$105,950			\$105,950
- Wild Basin	\$20,000			\$20,000
- Brush Country	\$72,800			\$72,800
<b>Sub-Total County Parks</b>	<b>\$750,358</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$62,046)</b>	<b>\$589,092</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,650,084</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$158,838)</b>	<b>\$1,354,676</b>
		<b>Indirect Costs</b>		<b>\$80,501</b>
				<b>\$1,435,177</b>

Attachment IV - Deletions to Current Level of Service FY 1990/91

Assumes maintenance levels will be the same as at City Parks.

	Total	Softball Comparable		Total
	Basic	Program	Service	Proposed
LCRA Parks	Budget	Reduction	Level	Budget
1 Arkansas Bend	\$18,982		(\$1,484)	\$17,498
2 Cypress Creek	\$66,650		(\$10,389)	\$56,260
3 Hippie Hollow	\$98,643		(\$13,358)	\$85,286
4 Mansfield Dae	\$117,146		(\$29,876)	\$87,271
5 Pace Bend	\$167,207		(\$29,876)	\$137,331
6 Sandy Creek	\$19,121		(\$1,484)	\$17,636
7 Windy Point/Romberg	\$134,396		(\$10,326)	\$124,070
Planning/Design	\$21,139			\$21,139
Ops. Manager	\$33,243			\$33,243
Administration	\$37,349			\$0
Capital	\$175,850			\$175,850
- Pace Bend EMS/Fire	\$10,000			\$10,000
<b>Sub-Total LCRA Parks</b>	<b>\$899,725</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$96,793)</b>	<b>\$765,584</b>
<b>County Parks</b>				
8 Allen	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
9 Dink Pearson	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
10 Fritz Hughes	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
11 Hamilton Pool	\$82,781		(\$1,484)	\$81,297
12 Loop 360 Boat Ramp	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
13 Mary Quinlan	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
14 Richard Noya	\$116,468	(\$10,000)	(\$45,720)	\$60,748
15 Sela Hughes	\$3,064		(\$1,484)	\$1,580
16 Del Valle/Noya Fields	\$109,077	(\$31,872)	(\$1,484)	\$75,721
17 Tom Hughes	\$3,063		(\$1,484)	\$1,579
18 Webberville	\$107,553		(\$1,484)	\$106,069
19 Windmill Run	\$3,063		(\$1,484)	\$1,579
20 Anzor	\$0			\$0
Planning/Design	\$31,708			\$31,708
Ops. Manager	\$22,162			\$22,162
Administration	\$37,349			\$0
Replacement Capital	\$105,950			\$105,950
- Wild Basin	\$20,000			\$20,000
- Brush Country	\$72,800			\$72,800
<b>Sub-Total County Parks</b>	<b>\$730,358</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$62,046)</b>	<b>\$589,092</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,630,084</b>	<b>(\$41,872)</b>	<b>(\$158,838)</b>	<b>\$1,354,676</b>
		Indirect Costs		\$80,501
				<b>\$1,435,177</b>



BUDGET AND RESEARCH DEPARTMENT



TCAB, Suite 500  
314 W. 11th St.  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 473-9171  
Director—(512) 473-9141

8/15/90  
8/15/90  
3/15/90  
CB  
F-111

MEMORANDUM:

TO: BILL ALESHIRE, COUNTY JUDGE  
SAMUEL T. BISCOE, COMMISSIONER, PCT. #1  
BRUCE TODD, COMMISSIONER, PCT. #2  
PAM REED, COMMISSIONER, PCT. #3  
HANK GONZALEZ, COMMISSIONER, PCT. #4

FROM: MARVA SCALLION, ACTING BUDGET DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: BARD SUMMARY OF TRAVIS COUNTY PARKS  
FY 91 BUDGET SCENARIOS

DATE: AUGUST 13, 1990

The Commissioners Court instructed BARD on July 11, 1990, to prepare a proposal summarizing options on park administration, maintenance, and organization. The following scenarios include the total original Parks FY 91 budget request, a current level of service budget with more efficient staffing patterns and work schedules, a current level of service budget with more efficient staffing patterns and merging with PITD, and finally the current level of service budget BARD is recommending for the 1991 fiscal year, which incorporates all cost-savings measures at our disposal. BARD does not recommend a level of service reduction for Parks at this time; rather, by consolidating the department with PITD, it is anticipated that efficiencies in level of service will be identified during the FY 91 implementation. The implementation BARD is recommending represents a total savings of \$144,977 from the FY 90 original budget, and a lowering of \$550,586 from the FY 91 original request, without reducing the current level of service.

MS/ja

BUDGET AND RESEARCH DEPARTMENT SUMMARY OF  
TRAVIS COUNTY PARKS FY 91 BUDGET

Travis County Parks Department's FY 91 budget request was originally \$1,703,796\*. By utilizing the staffing adjustments recommended by the Parks Department (Attachment B in its August 8 Report), \$58,718 savings may be realized, for a total of \$1,645,078.

<u>FY 91 Parks Total</u>	<u>Less Staff Adjustments</u>	
<u>Original Request</u>	<u>Recommended-Attach B</u>	<u>Comments</u>
P 1,065,951	1,080,033	These recommended adjustments would eliminate the \$72,800 Brush Country Services contract, RIF the Recreational Sports Supervisor and two Parks Worker I Positions (one presently vacant), add 9,040 hours of Temporary, and reclass four positions to assume additional responsibilities.
O 299,670	226,870	
C 338,175	338,175	
T 1,703,796	1,645,078	

Merging the Parks Department with PITD would represent further savings by eliminating three and a half more positions (Parks Administrator, Parks Technician, Senior Secretary, and a half-time Administrative Secretary). Allowing for a 90-day RIF, \$94,457 savings in addition to the \$58,718 would result, for a total savings of \$153,175.

<u>FY Parks Total</u>	<u>Less Staff Adjustments</u>	<u>Merging Parks Administration</u>
<u>Original Request</u>	<u>Recommended-Attach B</u>	<u>within PITD</u>
P 1,065,951	1,080,033	985,576
O 299,670	226,870	226,870
C 338,175	338,175	338,175
T 1,703,796	1,645,078	1,550,621

\*Parks original request omitted the \$72,800 Brush Country Services Contract, and it is added to the operating total. Also, the Personnel total represents an additional \$13,645 for Tom Hughes Park, approved July 11, 1990.



The resulting \$1,550,621 Parks Budget, of course, assumes no other reductions; in fact, however, due to the grave financial situation County-wide, across-the-board reductions have cut all training, travel, national memberships, capital, as well as adjustments in dental, worker's compensation, and the three line items making up the 4.5% salary savings reserve (Regular salaries, FICA, and Retirement). As a result, BARD is recommending a Parks Budget that incorporates Parks' recommended staffing adjustments, further reductions by merging Parks Administration with PITD, and the across-the-board cuts for a net reduction in the original request of \$550,586.

FY 91 Parks Total

	<u>Original Request</u>	<u>Less Staff Adjustment</u>	<u>PITD Merge</u>	<u>BARD REC</u>
P	1,065,951	1,080,033	985,576	933,680
O	299,670	226,870	226,870	219,530
C	<u>338,175</u>	<u>338,175</u>	<u>338,175</u>	<u>0</u>
T	1,703,796	1,645,078	1,550,621	1,153,210

The recommended total of \$1,153,210 compared to the Parks FY 90 original budget is as follows:

<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
<u>Original Budget:</u>	<u>BARD REC</u>
P 987,161	933,680
O 311,026	219,530
<u>C 0</u>	<u>0</u>
T 1,298,187	1,153,210

FY 91 BARD REC represents \$144,977 total cost savings from the FY 90 original budget.

**PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT**

**SHYRA DARR, DIRECTOR**

811 Barton Springs Road  
Suite 700  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 472-7483



*3/27/90*  
*Read/Kind*  
*KN*  
*30*  
*AK*  
*1 ms*  
*DE*

August 13, 1990

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Scott Ferguson  
Director, Parks Department

**FROM:** Shyra Darr  
Director

**SUBJECT:** Consolidation of Parks Department and PITD

The Travis County Parks Department and PITD perform many of the same functions, including maintenance activities (such as litter pick-up, brush cutting/clearing, and mowing) and planning/administrative functions (such as environmental planning and CIP project management). The major functions which are performed by Parks but not PITD are recreational sports management and seven-day-a-week fee collection. The major organizational difference between the two departments is that PITD's staff is much larger and more able to specialize than Park's staff. This has allowed PITD to develop a systems approach whereby a large volume of work can be produced by a highly specialized staff utilizing automated systems. In addition, PITD management is able to delegate most of the routine daily tasks and can concentrate on planning and directing the work.

The greatest potential cost savings due to a consolidation of PITD and Parks can be found in the area of management/administration. There is no evidence to indicate that PITD can perform parks maintenance functions better than current Parks employees, but the systems used by PITD to manage its programs could benefit Parks considerably. Following is a summary of the areas in which PITD can support Parks operations within the framework of our existing organization:

**Administrative Services**

- 1) Phone answering - PITD has two full-time receptionists who are trained to direct calls to the appropriate individual. During the peak summer months, we understand that all of Parks' administrative staff may be called upon to answer phones, and the resulting interruptions can reduce staff productivity considerably. PITD's administrative staff is able to handle all incoming calls with a minimum of delay to either the caller or staff.



- 2) Clerical pooling - PITD's clerical staff is centrally controlled so that additional staff can be allocated to areas which are experiencing unusually high workloads. Since Parks' workload peaks in the summer months, this can result in more efficient use of staff time over the course of the year.
- 3) Record-keeping - PITD maintains a central file system (with a file clerk) and an extensive data processing system to maintain records for a variety of functions. These can support Parks' record-keeping needs in areas such as chemical applications, revenue receipts, inventories, and recreational use reservations.

#### Financial Services

- 1) Accounting/auditing - PITD's financial accounting staff and automated systems provide a degree of control over purchasing, payroll, and revenues that cannot be provided by the one technician responsible for this function in Parks. These systems can also help automate the preparation of LCRA reporting documents.
- 2) Capital replacement planning - PITD utilizes a computerized inventory management system to analyze equipment condition and service life. Adding parks equipment to this system would improve capital replacement planning for Parks without significantly increasing PITD's workload in this area.
- 3) Specification writing - PITD's financial staff work closely with field personnel to determine appropriate material and equipment specifications, then draft the specifications and handle bidding and contract award. This allows the field personnel to concentrate on their line functions while ensuring bid documents are correct and consistent. Parks would experience similar benefits under PITD's system.
- 4) Grant billings - As the staff coordinator for the Austin Transportation Study, PITD has extensive experience processing grant billings and has financial staff capable of handling Parks' grant billings as well.
- 5) Revenue collections - PITD collects revenue at all five of its offices and has runners on staff to transfer collections to the County Treasurer's office, as well as a system to account for the revenue. Parks' revenue would be handled in a similar manner.
- 6) Budget planning - PITD's budget is prepared jointly by the members of its management team. Research of budget issues is provided by the budget analyst and planners, so that departmental managers can concentrate on decision-making rather than time-consuming financial research. Parks could easily be included in this process, although PITD's workload in the early months of the budget process would be increased.



- 7) Contract/lease management - PITD manages several leases and numerous contracts through its financial services division. Specialization in this area makes the management of contracts and leases routine, whereas in many smaller departments this function often is under-attended.

#### Planning and Program Development

- 1) Planning activities - PITD has several urban and regional planners on staff who are qualified to assist in parks planning activities such as master planning, environmental planning, transportation planning, and parks program planning. While not obviating the need for an experienced parks planner, PITD's staffing situation would spread the workload and increase the effort being spent on planning.
- 2) Management/operations planning - PITD's planning division also conducts research regarding departmental operations to determine appropriate levels of service delivery and staffing, and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the operation. This function, which can produce significant long-term savings, often requires several months of intensive research on major issues. Such an investment of time and energy cannot be made by smaller departments without crippling the day-to-day operations, yet is necessary to achieve real cost savings.

#### Engineering/Development Services

- 1) Project management - PITD's management of its CIP projects has required a significant investment of personnel and resources for contract negotiation/administration (for a variety of professional services), design review, budgeting, land acquisition, utility coordination, and construction management. The valuable experience gained in these areas could be of immeasurable benefit to Parks.
- 2) Surveying - PITD sometimes provides surveying for other governments and departments when requested, including Parks. Although PITD has a large backlog of survey work and only one survey crew, the switch to automated surveying and computer-aided drafting (CAD) is beginning to increase productivity, and this together with the consolidation of Parks and PITD could facilitate increasing survey control at Travis County parks.
- 3) Erosion/sedimentation control design - Both Parks and PITD provide erosion and sedimentation (E/S) control devices where appropriate, and both will be adding non-point source pollution controls in the future. PITD has engineers and planners on staff who are experienced in the design of E/S and pollution controls, and who can provide these services for Parks.

#### Road Maintenance

- 1) Work orders - PITD's new work order system (soon to be upgraded and expanded) provides a mechanism to ensure that all requests for service from the public are addressed appropriately and in a timely manner. Parks could be



included on this system without significantly increasing PITD's workload.

- 2) Dispatch - PITD utilizes a central radio dispatcher to track crew locations, facilitate communications, coordinate work order assignments, and order materials. Several staff members have been cross-trained to provide back-up support, and efforts are underway to computerize most of the dispatch functions. This function will also be integrated with PITD's work order and geographic information systems (GIS). Parks is already on the same radio system, and could utilize PITD's central dispatching.

PITD has gradually increased its productivity over the last 2-3 years as it has identified inefficiencies in its operations and sought alternative methods of service delivery. Integral to this effort has been the shift toward staff specialization and coordination of related activities such as road maintenance and Transportation Improvements Program (TIP) planning. At the same time, systems have been developed and implemented to collect a wide range of information regarding department operations to assist future planning efforts.

It appears that the additional administrative workload due to the consolidation of PITD and Parks could be accommodated by PITD's current staff. The systems for planning and operating the department are already in place, and Parks would be placed on these systems immediately so that information needed for management decision-making would begin to be collected. Line functions would continue to be performed by Parks staff, operating as a separate program within the department.

We believe that, of the administrative staff, only the Operations Manager and Parks Planner positions will need to be retained. Further changes to the organization would be made as information regarding Parks operations is collected, with most major changes, if any are required, being made with next year's budget. Areas which would be looked at could include sharing of equipment, crew configurations and scheduling, and seasonal staffing. Although changes to the CIP administration would be likely, consolidation would not improve PITD's inability to allocate staff to construct Parks CIP projects.

Budget numbers associated with the consolidation of Parks and PITD have been prepared by Budget and Research Department and have been included in BARD's recommended budget for FY 1991.

JAR:SD:dr

cc County Judge  
County Commissioners  
Leroy Click  
Joe Gieselman